

REMARKS

[0001] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-11, 13-18 and 20-23 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16-18, and 20-23 are amended herein

Claim 16 Complies With § 112 2nd Paragraph

[0002] Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0003] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claim 16 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 112, ¶ 2 rejections moot.

Claims 1, 3-18 and 20-23 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

[0004] Claims 1, 3-18 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0005] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims

1, 16, 17, and 22 as shown above. Claims 3-11, 13-15, 18, 20-21 and 23 depend from claims 1, 16, 17, and 22 and therefore claim statutory subject matter. Further claim 12 was previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 101 rejection moot.

Cited Document

[0006] Klevenz: Klevenz et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0137540 has been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application.

§ 102 Rejections

[0007] Claims 1, 3-18, 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Klevenz. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0008] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 6) the following in pertinent part with regard to claim 1:

Regarding claim 1, Klevenz discloses a system for displaying item collection previews "a user interface state comprises a navigation state stored in a stack structure, and placing information about a replacement pane in a user interface state comprises pushing information about the replacement pane onto the stack structure", (Par. 0015) comprising: at least one display object having metadata tags that describe two or more data items in a collection of data items "metadata to categorize documents into multiple taxonomies, for browsing and/or retrieval", (Par. 0058, Fig. 5B, Par. 0080, Par. 0081), "information could include information about data", (Par. 0059);

[0009] Further, the Examiner indicates (Action, p. 6-7) the following in pertinent part with regard to claim 1:

one or more controller inputs to control the presentation of the items, wherein a user utilizes the one or more controller inputs to navigate the collection of data items via selecting an item in the collection, "a user interface may present data of an application in an organized format. Furthermore, a user interface may allow a user to navigate through data and select certain data for more detailed analysis. Additionally, a user interface may contain a data entry portion. Thus, a user interface may present data to and receive data from a user for an application", (Par. 0040) selecting the item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection "the user interface state would be updated to reflect replacement of a pane in the page with the next pane", (Par. 0065), allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer grained manner starting at the selected item "system and technique may allow for finer-grained navigation than on a page level. Moreover, the navigation may be fluid as it may proceed forward and/or backward and different actions for a control may affect the navigation differently", (Par. 0028).

[0010] The cited art of Klevenz does not describe each and every recital of claim 1 which is copied below (in pertinent part) with emphasis added:

at least one display object having metadata tags describing two or more collections of data items, ***each collection of data items being a differing application;***

...
one or more controller inputs to control ***the presentation of the collections of data items***, wherein a user utilizes the one or more controller inputs to ***navigate the collections of data items via selecting a collection***, wherein selection of the collection changes the order of the collections of data items and moves the selected collection to the front of the collections of data items allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collections of data items in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected collection.

[0011] Klevenz describes at ¶ [0058] and ¶ [0059]:

[0058] In particular embodiments, server 140 includes an abstraction layer and a service directory. The abstraction layer is operable to extract, correlate, and/or understand information and logic in an enterprise infrastructure. In accomplishing this, the abstraction layer may aggregate and classify the information. For example, the abstraction layer may use metadata to categorize documents into multiple taxonomies, for browsing and/or retrieval. In particular embodiments, the layer stores pointers to documents in a folder hierarchy, which ensures non-redundant storage and allows access control to be tied to the roles of users. The service directory, in turn, stores information regarding a user of system 100. For example, the service directory may store information regarding attributes that a user possesses for a certain role. For instance, a user that is a system administrator may be able to access and change all types of information in the enterprise infrastructure, but a user that is a content provider may only be able to access and change certain types of information in the enterprise infrastructure. Furthermore, the service directory could store information regarding personal preferences of a user. Application framework 142 may be operable to determine how to present information to a user while taking into account a user's role—administrator, casual user, content provider, or otherwise.

[0059] An enterprise infrastructure may contain resources, which could include data and applications. Data could include folders, documents, files, databases, Web content, business analytics, and/or any other appropriate grouping of information, whether structured or unstructured. The information itself could be technical papers, presentations, drawings, calculation sheets, and/or on-line discussions, for example. Furthermore, information could include information about data. Applications, in turn, could contain logic that implements business processes. The applications could perform any appropriate function for a business process, such as, for example, order entry, order fulfillment, demand forecasting, supply chain management, enterprise resource management, and/or human resource management. Such applications are commonly provided by companies such as SAP, BAAN, Peoplesoft, and the like. The input to and/or output from an application, along with its functions, are also information that may be displayed in a user interface.

[0012] Klevenz merely describes employing metadata of documents to categorize the documents into multiple taxonomies. This is done for browsing and/or retrieval of the documents. See ¶ [0058]. Klevenz has no mention of categorizing collections of data items with each collection being a differing application, as recited by claim 1. Further Klevenz describes that the input to and/or output from an application are information that may be displayed in a user interface. Klevenz has no mention of presenting the collection of data items (the applications) on a user interface, much less a user navigating the collections of data items (the applications) and selecting a collection of data items (the applications), as recited by claim 1.

[0013] As shown above, the cited art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Remaining Pending Claims

[0014] In addition to their own merits, dependent claims 3-11 and 13-15 are allowable for the same reasons that independent claim 1 is allowable. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 3-11 and 13-15.

[0015] Further, Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight to independent claims 16, 17, and 22 and the cited art does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of independent claims 16, 17, and 22. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims. Further, dependent claims 18, 20, 21, and 23 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend are allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 18, 20, 21, and 23.

Conclusion

[0016] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Serial No.: 10/801,799
Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4145US
Atty/Agent: Michael D. Carter

-15-

 **The Business of IP®**

www.leeandhayes.com • 500.324.0256

Representative for Applicant

/Michael D. Carter 56661/

Dated: /July 14, 2009/

Michael D. Carter (michaelcarter@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5004)
Registration No. 56661

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162x5005)
Registration No. 53725